## **REMARKS**

Claims 26-50 were presented for examination in this application. The instant amendment cancels non-elected claims 45-50, as well as claim 29, without prejudice. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to file a divisional application directed to the non-elected subject matter. Thus, claims 26-28 and 30-44 remain pending upon entry of the instant amendment. Claims 26 and 44 are independent.

Claims 26–33 and 38-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gantley (U.S. 4,138,304). Claims 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gantley in view of Duran et al (U.S. 4,828,052). Claims 40-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gantley in view of Dietz (U.S. 2003/0148057).

Independent claim 26 has been clarified to recite, in part, the step of "releasing the bonding force between the carrier film and the plurality of components <u>with the application of UV light to the bonding force</u> (emphasis added)".

Applicants submit that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest amended claim 26.

Gantley discloses a wafer 30 provided with a layer of strippable coating material 32 applied to the side of wafer 30 opposite the side on which devices are formed. Mounting of the wafer 30 to membrane 40 is accomplished by physically placing the membrane and the coated wafer in face-to-face relationship, the coated surface of the wafer abutting the surface of the membrane, and applying heat to the opposite side of the wafer. See col. 6, lines 45-50. Next, Gantley discloses trimming the wafer 30 into pellets by sawing, where the pellets after sawing are retained on membrane 40 in the same orientation that they had on the wafer and in the same relative position. Then, the pellets are pick up from the membrane 40 in a number of ways. See col. 8, lines 1-5.

Applicant notes that Gantley is silent as to how the mounting between the pellets and the membrane 40 caused by the strippable coating material 32 is overcome during pellet removal.

However, Applicant submits Gantley clearly fails to disclose or suggest the step of "releasing the bonding force between the carrier film and the plurality of components with the application of UV light to the bonding force" of amended claim 26.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the remaining cited art, namely Duran and Dietz, fail to cure the aforementioned deficiency noted in Gantley.

Accordingly, claim 26, as well as claims 27-28 and 30-43 that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 26-28 and 30-43 are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 44 has been amended to recite, in part, the step of "releasing the bonding force by the application of UV light (emphasis added)".

Again, Applicants submit that Gantley is at best silent as to how the mounting between the pellets and the membrane 40 caused by the strippable coating material 32 is overcome during pellet removal, but clearly fails to disclose or suggest the application of UV light as in amended claim 44. Further, the remaining cited art, namely Duran and Dietz, fail to cure the aforementioned deficiency noted in Gantley.

Accordingly, claim 44 is also in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 44 are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration and passage of this application to issuance.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with Applicant's attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below.

July <u>/6</u>, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Charles N. J. Ruggiero

Reg. No. 28,468

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P. One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> floor

Stamford, CT 06901-2682

Tel: (203) 327-4500 Fax: (203) 327-6401